



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

m'
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N
10/021,788	11/28/2001	Juan Carlos Miro		1993

7590 10/18/2004
JUAN CARLOS MIRO
227 EDWARD AVENUE
FULLERTON, CA 92833

EXAMINER	
ARYANPOUR, MITRA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3711	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,788

Applicant(s)

MIRO ET AL.

Examiner

Mitra Aryanpour

Art Unit

3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☒ Other: marked-up copy of the Spec.

constitute an instruction to cancel. Any claims added by amendment must be indicated as (new) and shall not be underlined.

- (5) All of the claims in each amendment paper must be presented in ascending numerical order. Consecutive canceled or withdrawn claims may be aggregated into one statement (e.g. Claims 1 – 5 (canceled)).

Example of listing of claims:

Claims 1-5 (canceled)

Claim 6 (withdrawn)

Claim 7 (previously amended): A bucket with a handle.

Claim 8 (currently amended): A bucket with a ~~green~~ blue handle.

Claim 9 (withdrawn)

Claim 10 (original): The bucket of claim 8 with a wooden handle.

Claim 11 (canceled)

Claim 12 (new): A bucket with plastic sides and bottom.

Claim 13 (previously added): A bucket having a circumferential upper lip.

Claim 14 (re-presented – formerly claim 11): A black bucket with a wooden handle.

B) Amendments to the specification:

Amendments to the specification may be made by presenting a replacement paragraph, section or substitute specification marked up to show changes made relative to the immediate prior version. An accompanying clean version is not required and should not be presented.

C) Amendments to drawing figures:

Drawing changes may be made by presenting replacement figures which incorporate the proposed changes and which comply with § 1.84. An explanation of the changes made must be presented in the remarks section of the amendment. If the changes to the drawing figure(s) are not approved by the examiner, applicant will be informed in the next Office action. Any replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even though only one figure may be amended. The figure or figure number of the amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.”

Any questions regarding the submission of amendments pursuant to the revised practice set forth in this flyer should be directed to the following legal advisors in the Office of Patent Legal Administration (OPLA): Elizabeth Dougherty (Elizabeth.Dougherty@uspto.gov), Gena Jones (Eugenia.Jones@uspto.gov) or Joe Narcavage (Joseph.Narcavage@uspto.gov). For information on the waiver or legal aspects of the prototype, please contact Jay Lucas (Jay.Lucas@uspto.gov), Senior Legal Advisor (PCTLA) or Rob Clarke (Robert.Clarke@uspto.gov), Senior Legal Advisor (OPLA). Alternatively, further information may be obtained by calling OPLA at (703) 305-1616.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES

Replacement Drawing Sheets

Drawing changes must be made by presenting replacement figures which incorporate the desired changes and which comply with 37 CFR 1.84. An explanation of the changes made must be presented either in the drawing amendments, or remarks, section of the amendment. Any replacement drawing sheet must be identified in the top margin as "Replacement Sheet" (37 CFR 1.121(d)) and include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even though only one figure may be amended. The figure or figure number of the amended drawing(s) must not be labeled as "amended." If the changes to the drawing figure(s) are not accepted by the examiner, applicant will be notified of any required corrective action in the next Office action. No further drawing submission will be required, unless applicant is notified.

Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and centered within the top margin.

Annotated Drawing Sheets

A marked-up copy of any amended drawing figure, including annotations indicating the changes made, may be submitted or required by the examiner. The annotated drawing sheets must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Marked-up Drawings" and accompany the replacement sheets.

Timing of Corrections

Applicant is required to submit acceptable corrected drawings within the time period set in the Office action. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in ABANDONMENT of the application.

If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings MUST be filed within the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period set for reply in the "Notice of Allowability." Extensions of time may NOT be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability.

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

Art Unit: 3711

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally **limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words**. It is important that the abstract **not exceed 150 words** in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and **legal phraseology** often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," **should be avoided**. **The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.**

The language **should be** clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It **should avoid** using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use. ***See attached marked-up copy.***

2. The title of the invention must appear on the first page of the specification: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive; preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.
3. The use of the trademark HEATBALL has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.
4. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification. ***See attached marked-up copy of the Specification.***

Art Unit: 3711

5. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The subject matter(s) presented in the amended specification raises new matter, since there is no support in the disclosure as filed. Applicant has revised the specification to include rules and steps that had not been presented in this application. Applicant is required to remove all such inclusions from the specification. Furthermore, Applicant is required to provide a marked up copy of the amended section, and to provide support for such additions.

Claim Objections

6. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not). **Misnumbered claims 1-7 been renumbered 8-14.** Additionally, it should be noted that the Amendments to claims filed on 23 March 2004 is not in compliant with 37 CFR 1.121 which requires each claim to be provided with the proper status identifier, and as such, the individual status of each claim cannot be identified. *See attached sheet for examples of the status identifier.*

7. Claims 8-14 are objected to because of the following informalities: Each claim should begin with a capital letter and end with a period. Periods may not be used elsewhere in the claims except for abbreviations. See *Fressola v. Manbeck*, 36 USPQ2d 1211 (D.D.C. 1995). Where a claim sets for a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation, 37 CFR 1.75(i). Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 3711

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. See claim 8, design of multiple courts and design of multiple baskets. See claim 10, in order for the scoring shot to be valid the player must cross a neutral zone area of the court with the ball to perform the operation of heating up the ball symbolically.

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

12. Regarding claims 8-14, it is important to recognize that a Trademark or Trade Name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the good themselves. Thus a Trademark or Trade

Art Unit: 3711

Name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the Trademark or Trade Name. See definitions of Trademark and Trade Name in MPEP 608.01(v). A Trademark or Trade Name used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product does not comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Ex parte Simpson, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the Trademark or Trade Name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. In fact, the value of the Trademark or Trade Name would be lost to the extent that it became descriptive of a product, rather than used as an identification of a source or origin of a product. Thus, the use of a Trademark or Trade Name in a claim to identify or describe a material or product would not only render a claim indefinite, but would also constitute an improper use of the Trademark or Trade Name. If the Trademark or Trade Name appears in a claim and is not intended as a limitation in the claim, then the question of why it is in the claim arises and whether or not its presence causes confusion as to the scope of the claimed subject matter.

13. Claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that they fail to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. The claims are omnibus type claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3711

15. Claims 8, 11, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Eden et al (5,993,335).

Regarding claim 8, Eden et al shows a sports court design and method of play; wherein the court has a planar section (10) generally rectangular in shape, a curved ramp section (12) and top planar surface (14) which are used as jump ramps surrounding the playing field (see figure 1), wherein the teams meet game objectives and rules (column 3, lines 6-55). The game provides one player from one team which has gained ball possession. With regards to multiple court and basket designs, the playing field and goals vary to meet the needs of individual games being played (see column 3, lines 62-67; columns 4-17 in its entirety; and column 18, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 11, Eden et al shows the players will follow certain formations to commence the game, other plays during game and special shots (see Rules 9 and 66).

Regarding claim 12, Eden et al shows the ball when used has a symbolic status of hot and cold. It should be noted that the broadest reasonable interpretation of ball having symbolic status of hot and cold would include when the ball is in play and when the ball is out-of-bounds.

Regarding claim 14, Eden et al additionally provides rules pertaining to referees and field judges involved in the game (see Rules 57-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eden et al (5,993,335) in view of Hatley (2,545,615).

Regarding claim 9, the number of points awarded for shooting said ball through said basket depends on the position of a player. Hatley shows an inventive game that utilizes features from the games of football and basketball, wherein the game has a set of rules and the number of points awarded for shooting said ball through said basket depends on the position of a player, and circles found on the playing field (see column 3, lines 1-48). In view of Hatley it would have been obvious to designate different point values for the different areas on the playing field, the motivation being to enhance competitive interest, the development of teamwork and cooperation among the players.

Regarding claim 13, Eden et al does not disclose expressly a basket-like goal having a single basket on top of a pole. Hatley additionally, shows an inventive game that utilizes features from the games of football and basketball, wherein the goal is a basket-like goal having a single basket on top of a pole and a basket like goal having seven rings, six rings in the horizontal position (goal rings 12; see figure 2) and one ring in the vertical position (head 13; see figure 1), poles (standard 15) supporting such baskets are attached by bolts to the ground. This arrangement enhances the competitive interest and permits access from any point 360 degrees around the goal post allowing the game to be played on different shape playing fields. Hatley, further teaches that the number of rings can be varied. In view of Hatley, it would have been obvious to use an upright basket for the goal of Eden et al, the motivation being to enhance the competitive interest which allows access from any point 360 degrees around the goal post allowing the game to be played on different shape playing fields.

Art Unit: 3711

18. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eden et al (5,993,335) in view of Leonard et al (4,284,277).

Regarding claim 10, Eden et al does not disclose expressly that the playing field has a neutral zone. Inasmuch as applicant has shown and described the aforementioned, Leonard et al shows a game having a playing field, wherein the playing field is divided into zones (zones I, II and III) wherein zone III is a neutral zone, a goal (2) is placed on the line facing the neutral zone (III). Leonard et al teaches that the game can be played with or without the neutral zone (III). In view of Leonard et al it would have been obvious to include a neutral zone on the playing field of Eden et al, the motivation being to enhance competitive interest, the development of teamwork and cooperation among the players.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed 23 March 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant should submit an argument under the heading "Remarks" pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions. Applicant must also discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them. as indicated above the use of Trademarks is not permissible in the claims.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., three team operation) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). As applicant has contended, the information applicant is relying on (i.e. rules, court design, formations, etc.) is provided in the

Art Unit: 3711

pictures and specification. However, applicant has failed to recite these features in the rejected claims. It should be further noted, that the features applicant is relying upon has no support in the specification as filed.

Conclusion

20. An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

Applicant is advised of the availability of the publication "Attorneys and Agents Registered to Practice Before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office." This publication is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

21. This action is a **final rejection** and is intended to close the prosecution of this application. Applicant's reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to this action is limited either to an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or to an amendment complying with the requirements set forth below.

If applicant should desire to appeal any rejection made by the examiner, a Notice of Appeal must be filed within the period for reply identifying the rejected claim or claims appealed. The Notice of Appeal must be accompanied by the required appeal fee (please check USPTO website for current fees).

Art Unit: 3711

If applicant should desire to file an amendment, entry of a proposed amendment after final rejection cannot be made as a matter of right unless it merely cancels claims or complies with a formal requirement made earlier. Amendments touching the merits of the application which otherwise might not be proper may be admitted upon a showing a good and sufficient reasons why they are necessary and why they were not presented earlier.

A reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection must include the appeal from, or cancellation of, each rejected claim. The filing of an amendment after final rejection, whether or not it is entered, does not stop the running of the statutory period for reply to the final rejection unless the examiner holds the claims to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, if a Notice of Appeal has not been filed properly within the period for reply, or any extension of this period obtained under either 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b), the application will become abandoned.

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3711

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mitra Aryanpour whose telephone number is 703-308-3550. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on 703-308-1513. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MA
07 October 2004



MITRA ARYANPOUR
PATENT EXAMINER